

Appl. No. 10/708,155
Amdt. dated June 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Satou
5 (US 6,517,212) for reasons of record.

Response:

The amended claim 1 now contains limitations stating that the prism contains a
plurality of optical planes, and light beams from the beam generators enter the prism
10 through one of the optical planes and the other optical planes reflect the light beams for
collecting the light beams to form an enhanced light beam. These amendments are fully
supported by the specification, and by Fig.2 of the instant application. As recited in claim
1, light from two different beam generators enters a single prism.

15 On the other hand, Satou teaches five pairs of prisms 28 in Fig.8. Each pair of prisms
contain a left prism corresponding to a first light source 1 and a right prism corresponding
to a second light source 2. Satou does not teach light from a plurality of beam generators
entering a single prism. Instead, Satou teaches that each prism only reflects light entering
the prism from a single light source. Therefore, Satou does not anticipate all of the
20 limitations of the amended claim 1. Claims 3-6 and 15 are dependent on claim 1, and
should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3-6, and 15 is
respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 13, 14, and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

25 Claims 13, 14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Satou and further in view of Butterworth et al. (US 6,005,722, hereinafter
Butterworth) for reasons of record.

Appl. No. 10/708,155
Amdt. dated June 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2005

Response:

Claims 13 and 14 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Claim 16 has been amended in the same was as claim 1 in order to distinguish
5 from both Satou and Butterworth. Claim 16 now recites that the light beams emitted from the beam generators enter a single prism through one of the optical planes, and the other optical planes reflect the light beams for collecting the light beams to form an enhanced light beam. As explained above, Satou does not teach using a single prism to reflect light emitted by two beam generators entering the prism. Butterworth also does not teach a
10 single prism reflecting light emitted by two generators entering the prism, and therefore, the amended claim 16 is patentable over the combination of Satou and Butterworth.

As for the prior art made of record and not relied upon, Stanton (US 6,196,699), Shouji (US 2003/0227598), and Tanaka (US 6,224,217) all teach prisms reflecting light
15 off the outer surfaces of the prisms, and do not teach light entering through one optical plane of the prism and reflecting off other optical planes of the prism. Therefore, amended claims 1 and 16 are patentably distinguished from these prior art references as well. Claims 17 and 19 are dependent on claim 16, and should be allowed if claim 16 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 13, 14, 16, 17, and 19 is respectfully requested.

20

3. Introduction to new claims 21 and 22:

New claims 21 and 22 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 16, respectively. Each of these claims contains the limitation stating that the prism is formed as a monolithic structure. As shown in the figures of the instant application,
25 such as Fig.2 and Fig.3, the prism 60 is a monolithic structure and constitutes a single prism.

On the other hand, Satou shows in Fig.8 that a pair of prisms 28 are used to reflect

Appl. No. 10/708,155
Amdt. dated June 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2005

light emitted from a first light source 1 and a second light source 2. The pair of prisms constitutes two distinct prisms, and therefore is not a monolithic prism structure, as is recited in new claims 21 and 22. Acceptance of claims 21 and 22 is respectfully requested.

5

In view of the above statements in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

10 Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 3, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

15 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C.
20 is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.